JL- launie m. ziebell's 11/24/76 in 1448 12/5/76

because of his posturing and pontificating and oretenses here as at the 12.2 hearing there may be some values to us.

he does not admit, of course, that the cia, whose assistant general counsel he is, is under court order to respond to our interrogatories. instead he says that because it "is not a party to thes suit abd thus, not technically obliged to respond,2 because "the Agency can provide information relating to the substance" they "will provide" answers in the ~~form~~ form ofvan affidavit.

whatever they do or do not do in thid case this is an admission i think we can use under other circumsyances and in this and other cases to get information from them when there is not a clear statutory exemption.

within the meaning od foia/pa i believe further, depending perhaps on the judge, they might be compelled to show morec than their interoretation of any claimed statutory exemption to escape response.

in no jfk/mlk instane is there any reasinable possibility of the exposure of a secret source, method, technique, etc., or of danger to any installation or person.

they are the withholding authority. note the letter i will be writing to jane smith on this today.

i think this mskes getting them under oath, on the record and before robinson even more important.

best,